FBIS DAILY REPORT

MIDDLE EAST & SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

8 APRIL 1986

Lebanon

Israeli Raid — The 7 April Israeli air attack southeast of Sidon was directed against Fatah and PFLP targets, IDF radio announced, adding that the planes raided command posts, a broadcasting station, training bases, and bases used as departure points by "terrorist squads." Lebanese security sources cited by the clandestine Radio Free Lebanon said 12 people were killed and 26 others were wounded in the attacks.

TWA Explosion Suspect — May Ilyas Mansur, the Lebanese woman suspected of planting a bomb aboard a TWA airliner, announced that she is ready to receive a Greek investigative committee, though she stated that she would not go to Greece for this purpose, Beirut radio reported. The Italian daily *CORRIERE DELLA SERA* revealed that Italy is considering seeking an international warrant for Mansur's arrest, AFP noted. Italy has ordered a "red alert" in response to threats from an Arab group seeking the release of two Lebanese terrorists imprisoned in Italy, AFP disclosed.

Israel

The Cabinet will meet 13 April to discuss the rift in the National Unity Government which developed following Finance Minister Yitzhaq Moda'i's critical remarks about Prime Minister Shim'on Peres published in Israeli newspapers, Jerusalem radio reported. IDF radio reported earlier that Peres proposed to Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir that the crisis could be resolved if Moda'i were transferred to another position in the government and another Likud minister took over as finance minister. In an interview with Jerusalem radio, Moda'i said that while he did not intend to offend Peres with his remarks, the incident is a "very artificial cause" for disbanding the government "even if I wronged, sinned, and offended."

Egypt-Israel

President Husni Mubarak received Abba Eban, chairman of the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, MENA reported. In their meeting in Cairo, Mubarak told Eban that once the Taba arbitration agreement is signed, a summit meeting with the Israeli prime minister will be held, the Egyptian ambassador will return to Tel Aviv, and all bilateral agreements will be fulfilled, according to Jerusalem television.

Libya

Libya has received an "official message" from the United States which states that the "real issue" between the two countries is that Libya constitutes a "danger" to U.S. interests, Staff Major 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud asserted in a speech broadcast by Tripoli television. Speaking to students on the anniversary of the 1976 student "revolution," Jallud called for cohesion between the revolutionary committees and the student masses in order to isolate "hostile and bourgeois" forces and prevent "reactionaries" from influencing students. As for the recent measures against the study of foreign languages in Libyan universities, Jallud acknowledged that Libyans need to learn languages like English for "technical and technological reasons," but he cautioned that teaching foreign languages can prove dangerous for the Arab "personality and identity." Jallud also called for greater student involvement in production activities, warning against "naive" people who try to "sabotage" such policies.

In another development, JANA announced the arrival in Tripoli of a Soviet delegation led by CPSU Central Committee member Konstantin Katushev.

In Egypt, the People's Assembly denounced statements made by a Socialist Labor Party delegation during its recent visit to Libya, MENA reported. The delegation had joined its Libyan hosts in denouncing the Camp David accords, according to a press statement broadcast by Voice of Greater Arab Homeland radio 4 April.

PLO Affairs

PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat dismissed PLO officer 'Atallah Muhammad 'Atallah, a Fatah official in Jordan, following reports that he is one of several Fatah officials involved in a Jordanian plan to "split" Fatah, KUNA reported citing the UAE's *AL-BAYAN*. In a statement to AFP reported by Radio Monte Carlo, another alleged participant, PLO officer Na'im al-Khatib, denied a report by the PFLP paper *AL-HADAF* that he was involved in the Jordanian plan. An "informed" source cited by KUNA reported that 'Arafat has stopped paying PLO forces in Jordan under Al-Khatib's command. In another development, Baghdad Voice of PLO radio reported the conclusion of the PLO Executive Committee meeting in Baghdad 7 April.

Jordanian-Syrian Relations

Jordan approved the appointment of an ambassador to Syria 5 April, the Jerusalem paper *AL-QUDS* reported, asserting that the Jordanian decision is in the framework of "clearing the climate" with Syria.

Iran-Iraq War

Iranian forces "crushed" an Iraqi offensive in Sharhani operational region and Majnun Islands 7 April according to a military communique cited by IRNA. On the Iraqi side, Iraqi forces liberated four mountain peaks in the Maysan area in a "sweeping" offensive, Voice of the Masses radio reported citing a military communique. Another military communique carried by the radio claimed that the Iraqi Air Force destroyed four bridges inside Iran.

FBIS **DAILY REPORT**

CONTENTS

South Asia

Vol VIII No 067 *8 April 1986*

MIDDLE EAST & SOUTH ASIA REVIEW i

AFGHANISTAN

UK Foreign Secretary's Visit to Pakistan Protested ..... C 1
AFP: Red Cross Official Arrives in Kabul ..... C 1
Weapons Confiscated From Lowgar Province ..... C 1

INDIA

Continuing Reportage, Commentary on Unrest in Punjab ..... E 1
Gandhi Calls For United Effort ..... E 1
Integration Council Adopts Resolution ..... E 1
250 'Preventive' Arrests ..... E 2
Curfew Imposed in Patiala ..... E 2
Cuba's Roa, External Affairs Secretary Hold Talks ..... E 2
State Minister Denies U.S. Approached for Arms ..... E 2
Commentator Views Howe Visit, Extradition of Sikhs ..... E 3

PAKISTAN

Protest Lodged With DRA Envoy Over Border Firing ..... F 1
Foreign Office Voices Satisfaction With SARC Meeting ..... F 1
Reportage on Visit of Swiss Foreign Minister ..... F 1
Arrives 7 April ..... F 1
Meets With Yaqub Khan ..... F 1
NAWA-E WAQT Views Benazir Bhutto's Visit to U.S. *[28 Mar]* ..... F 1
Commentary Cites IAEA Expert on Nuclear Program ..... F 3
Mujahidin Operations in Paktia Province Detailed ..... F 3

IRAN

Khamene'i Voices Confidence in Victory ..... I 1
Further Commentary on Bush Visit to Gulf States ..... I 1
U.S. Policy in Gulf War Criticized ..... I 1
Tehran Arabic on Bush Tour ..... I 1
Tour Linked to Oil Issues ..... I 2
Kuwait Warned on Supplying War Information to Iraq ..... I 2
Further Reportage on Visit of Zimbabwe's Mangwende ..... I 2
Joint Communique Signed ..... I 2
Commentary Attacks Trial of Muslims in Egypt ..... I 3
Forces From Qom, Tabriz Leave for Battlefronts ..... I 4
Reportage on Combat Operations in War With Iraq ..... I 4
Iraqi Offensive 'Crushed' ..... I 4
Opposition Paper Warns GCC Countries *[London KEYHAN 27 Mar]* ..... I 4

UK Foreign Secretary's Visit to Pakistan Protested

LD071825 Kabul Domestic Service in Dari 1600 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] In answer to a BAKHTAR correspondent, a spokesman from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said: Sir Geoffrey Howe, the British foreign secretary, paid an official visit to Pakistan.

During his stay in that country he carried out a series of provocative measures and hostile interventionist statements against the DRA and once again put the seal of approval on the anti-Afghan stand of the Conservative government of Britain, which consistently follows in the footsteps of the U.S. imperialists.

The British foreign secretary hypocritically stated that the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan is (?imperative) to peace.

How can he, however, conceal with such fabricated statements the fact that it is those who carry out the undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan — including the British Government — transforming Pakistan into a den of professional thieves and murderers and the center of export of Afghan counterrevolution, who have endangered peace in the region and, by taking such trips, fanned the flames of war.

He also expressed support for the Afghan counterrevolutionary bandits and terrorists residing in Pakistan and the military and reactionary government of that country who are the cause of the tense situation around Afhanistan and the executors of the (?schemes) and aggressive designs of international imperialism in the region; and he promised them further assistance.

According to him, the assistance to the Afghan counterrevolutionary elements in Pakistan in the current year, 1986, will increase by 17 percent and will reach a sum of 5,000,000 pounds sterling. This is the evidence that the British imperialists intend to intensify the undeclared war and the propaganda war against our independent, revolutionary, and nonaligned country — the DRA.

The British foreign secretary's visit to the regions of the free tribes and the historical Khyber Valley on the border of Afghanistan, where the old British colonialism had suffered several disgraceful defeats, was not only a provocative maneuver against the Pashtuns of the free tribal areas who are defending their traditional rights and freedoms against the aggression of Islamabad, but was also a provocative action against the DRA.

The DRA believes that such interventionist and subversive actions are being undertaken at a time when the prospects for progress at the talks in Geneva between the DRA and Pakistan — as a result of the constructive stand of the DRA — are becoming brighter. And since the British Government and its imperialist parteners do not want this process to yield results, they embark on measures to prevent its progress.

The DRA Ministry of Foreign Affairs condemns the provocative actions and hostile statements by the British foreign secretary which, in collusion with the government of Pakistan, have been made against our revolutionary country, in open violation of the accepted norms in international relations and an overt interference in the internal affairs of the DRA, and lodges a protest against it.

AFP: Red Cross Official Arrives in Kabul

AU081000 Paris AFP in English 0956 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] Geneva, April 8 (AFP) — The International Committee of the Red Cross said here on Tuesday that it had recently resumed contacts with Afghanistan, which were broken off by Kabul three-and-a-half years ago.

Jean de Courten, the ICRC delegation for Asia and the Pacific, went to Kabul on Friday for talks with the Afghan government, an official of the humanitarian organisation said.

He was the first ICRC representative to go to Kabul since the Afghan authorities ordered the ICRC out of the country in October 1982.

ICRC officials had been allowed into Afghanistan in 1980 shortly after the Soviet invasion and stayed five months. A second mission was sent in August 1982 but forced to leave when the authorities said their visas would not be renewed.

In both cases, the ICRC officials were only allowed to carry out their work, in particular visiting prisoners, within Kabul itself.

But in spring 1982 the ICRC managed to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the Afghan resistance, on the other, whereby Soviet soldiers captured by the guerrillas would be interned in Switzerland.

Under that accord 11 Soviet soldiers have been interned for two years ,the last returning home on March 26.

Mr. de Courten's task will be to persuade the Kabul authorities to allow the ICRC to carry out its humanitarian mission to the full throughout the country.

Weapons Confiscated From Lowgar Province

LD080651 Kabul BAKHTAR in English 0439 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] Kabul, April 7, BAKHTAR — As a result of a successful mopping up operations of the Armed Forces of the DRA in Mosaie of Lowgar Province a number of Chinese and American makes [as received], various assorted weapons and anti-state leaflets were captured.

During the operations 73 mortars including binoculars, one recoilless gun, bullets of ground-to-ground rocket, 7 anti-personnel and anti-tank mines, bullets of mortars, one reactive explosive machine and a number of American grenades were confiscated.

Besides a number hideouts of the enemies of the revolution were also destroyed.

Continuing Reportage, Commentary on Unrest in Punjab

Gandhi Calls For United Effort

BK070929 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] The prime minister has declared that terrorist attacks in Punjab must be seen as attacks on the integrity and unity of India and not just on the state government.

Inaugurating the meeting of the reconstituted national integration council at New Delhi this morning, Mr Rajiv Gandhi emphasized that no quarter must be given for terrorist or violent solutions to our problems when democratic solutions are available to all of them. We must all unite to fight the forces which are trying to destroy our country. He said the problem is from a group of highly motivated youngsters. Their motivation is not religious, but comes from elsewhere. Very few of them know what Sikhism is actually about.

The prime minister called for isolating the terrorists. He said we have to deal with them not just with police force but politically. It is in this regard that concerted action by the National Integration Council will go a long way. We have to stop the communal turn in Punjab and mobilize all the people. We have to make the silent majority vocal, he said. One of the suggestions that the prime minister put forward to the council is to consider how places of worship are to be used. Are they to be used as storehouses for weapons and arms, he asked. Are they to be used as hideouts for terrorists and antisocial elements?

Recalling the accord signed with Sant Longowal, Mr Rajiv Gandhi said the Sant was a man of goodwill and piety. Yet he was gunned down most ruthlessly in cowardly manner. He reiterated the government's full commitment to the accord and said we intend to go through with it in letter and in spirit.

The prime minister also recalled Gandhi's method of confronting terrorism through nonviolent and constructive work. He said political parties should work together to fight the disease of terrorism and violence. He said perhaps this session of the National Integration Council could come out with a mass campaign based on nonviolence to stop communalism to save Punjab.

In a reference to the communal incidents, Mr Rajiv Gandhi said we should today get together on a policy and program to repulse all such incidents. This has to be a continuing battle. The picture changes according to the region we are talking about. The majority in one part may be a minority in another. He said it is the majority which must give confidence to the minority in every such area.

In his opening remarks, the home minister, Mr P.V. Narasimha Rao said that the endeavor for national integration and unity of the country should be on a continued basis. He referred to the situation in Punjab and said the people have voted for peace. Unfortunately, some misguided elements continue to persist in violence and disruption. He spoke about the initiatives taken by the prime minister and said the government is earnest in implementing the Punjab accord in letter and in spirit.

Integration Council Adopts Resolution

BK080434 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0240 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] The National Integration Council has called for an end to the misuse of places of worship, particularly the illegal occupation of parts of the Golden Temple complex by subversive elements who have descrated its sanctity.

In a resolution, the council emphasized that places of worship must be kept free of terrorist and separatist elements. People must stand firm against obscurantism and extremism. They should dissociate themselves from those who preach violence and secession. Our borders must be secured against influx and infiltration and those who are guilty of destructive and violent acts must be punished. The council adopted the resolution by consensus last night after a marathon sitting which lasted for more than 10 hours in two sessions. The resolution was drafted by a six-member committee comprising Mr P.V. Narasimha Rao, Mr C. Rajeshwar Rao, Mr L.K. Advani, Mr Arjun Singh, Mr Khushwant Singh and Mr Prem Bhatia.

It noted that the council was meeting at a grave juncture when the dark forces of communalism are working hand in hand with those of violence, terrorism, subversion and externally instigated destabilization. It reaffirmed that secularism is the bedrock of our nationhood. The council also decided to set up a 21-member standing committee which will function on a continuing basis. It will formulate measures for preserving national integrity in its various aspects all over the country. Mr Jagjivan Ram will be the chairman of the standing committee. Its members will be the chief ministers of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Karntaka, Maharashtra, Mizoram, Punjab, and West Bengal and will include Mr Arjun Singh, the Congress-I vice president; Mrs Aruna Asaf Ali; Mr C. Rajeshwar Rao; Mr Charan Singh; Dr Farooq Abdullah; Mr Frank Anthony; Mr Khushwant Singh, the chairman of the Bhartiya Janata Party; Mr P.N. Haksar; Mr Prem Bhatia; Mr Sham Benegal; and Mr Sharad Pawar.

The resolution was released to newsmen in New Delhi at a briefing with the minister of state for home affairs, Mr Ram Niwas Mirdha and some of the members of the council. They said all political parties should involve themselves and help create an atmosphere of peace and harmony in the state. It was decided that the council will meet every 6 months. The next meeting will be held a little before the monsoon session of parliament.

The resolution refers to the rise of terrorism in Punjab and says all right-thinking people condemn the wanton disregard for human life by a small number of persons and the callous violation of every canon of true religion. It notes that despite numerous provocations and incitement of hatred, different communities of Punjab have maintained a high degree of amity and harmony. The resolution reaffirms that the Punjab government enjoys the full support of the center and the country. The Punjab accord is the broad framework for resolving outstanding issues.

Mr H.N. Bahuguna, who represented the Lok Dal at the council meeting, had certain reservations on this part of the resolution and proposed an amendment. The amendment was, however, not acceptable to the council. It said the implementation of the

accord would affect Haryana's peaceful atmosphere. Mr L.K. Advani of the Bhartiya Janata Party recalled that though his party was not entirely satisfied with the accord when it was signed, today its implementation is important. Not carrying it out will be more harmful.

Reacting to the day's proceedings, the Punjab chief minister, Mr Barnala, said the terrorists are not many in number. The state government is examining how to flush them out, who have occupied the part of the Golden Temple complex. He said the steps taken recently have shown good results and a number of terrorists have either been killed or arrested.

The Haryana chief minister, Mr Bhajan Dal, said his state will abide by whatever decision is taken to strengthen the country's integrity.

In his concluding remarks, the prime minister enjoined upon everyone to keep cool. He wanted all communities to give a soothing touch to the problem. Mr Rajiv Gandhi also spoke about strengthening our borders. He said there will be challenges, but we will overcome them.

250 'Preventive' Arrests

BK080312 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0240 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] In Punjab, about 250 preventive arrests have been made from different parts of the state. The arrests include a number of suspected terrorists and activists of the All India Sikh Students Federation and the Akali Dal led by Mr Joginder Singh.

According to an official spokesman in Chandigarh, the arrests have been made to thwart any possible attempt by the militants to further escalate their activities in the state from Baisakhi [13 April] day.

Raids are also continuing for those responsible for the recent shooting incidents in the state. The police have arrested another suspected terrorist, Jagtar Singh, in connection with the Nakodar shootout which claimed 8 lives. Three terrorists had earlier been arrested in this connection and a large quantity of arms and ammunition recovered from their possession. Jagtar Singh has confessed his involvement in some of the terrorist activities also.

Meanwhile, in Patiala some militants stabbed a youth last evening who later died in hospital. Speaking to newsmen in Hoshiarpur, the director general of the state police, Mr Ribeiro, said two more battalions of the Punjab armed police are being raised. He said police will be provided with more sophisticated arms to deal with the extremists.

Curfew Imposed in Patiala

BK080854 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] In Punjab, curfew has been clamped in Patiala till Thursday [10 April] to avert a clash between two unruly groups of youths. While one group was forcing the shopkeepers to close their shops, the other was asking not to do so. The tension in the town was building up since last evening following the killing of a youth by some extremists.

As already reported, about 250 preventive arrests have been made from different parts of the state. Those arrested include a number of suspected terrorists and activists of the All India Sikh Student Federation and the Akali Dal led by Mr Joginder Singh.

Cuba's Roa, External Affairs Secretary Hold Talks

BK071401 Delhi General Overseas Service in English 1330 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] The Cuban vice minister for foreign affairs, Mr Raul Roa, who is leading his country's delegation to the 5th meeting of the action program for economic cooperation among nonaligned countries, today held discussions with Indian officials on bilateral issues.

The Indian side was led by the secretary in the External Affairs Ministry, Dr Teja. An official spokesman told newsmen in New Delhi today that they have also discussed the issues pertaining to the forthcoming nonaligned foreign ministers summit.

State Minister Denies U.S. Approached for Arms

BK071607 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] The minister of state for defense, Mr Arun Singh, categorically denied in the Lok Sabha today that India has approached the United States for purchase of arms. Intervening in the debate on his ministry's budgetary demands, Mr Singh said India has not even discussed with the U.S. Government purchase of any weapons of any size. He drew a distinction between cooperation on technology and purchase of arms. While India has been discussing with the U.S. Government on cooperation in some of the high technologies relevent to our programs, it has not approached the United States for any arms purchases, either as outside purchase or in any licensed production context. Mr Singh said we will consider the American sources along with other alternatives in the best interest of the country.

Highlighting various achievements of the defense research and development organization, the minister said the main battle tank and light combat aircraft now being developed indigenously will be fitted with indigenous engines at the time of production. He also asserted that all the subsystems required by the tank are being developed within the country. One of the major achievements is the development of surveillance radar which, he said, is equal to the best in the world.

Earlier, also intervening in the discussion, the minister of state for defense production, Mr Sukh Ram, assured the house that government has taken necessary steps to produce sophisticated weapons to defend the integrity of the country. He said India is committed to world peace and has taken steps to forge friendly relations with her neighbors. However, four wars had been thrust on the country since independence and we could not remain silent when a neighboring country is acquiring sophisticated weapons.

Initiating the discussion, Mr Ayyaku Reddy, Telugu Desam, made a strong plea that the country must have a nuclear deterrent. The Congress-I members expressed confidence that the country has a know-how and the capability of producing a nuclear deterrent and can go in for it as and when required. The debate was inconclusive.

Commentator Views Howe Visit, Extradition of Sikhs

BK041045 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1545 GMT 3 Apr 86

["Spotlight" program: "Talks on Sir Geoffrey Howe's Visit to India" by S. Viswam, chief of the New Delhi bureau, *THE TRIBUNE*, Chandigarh]

[Text] History provides few examples of a colonial power and its erstwhile colony maintaining such close and friendly bilateral relations as do Britain and India. Indeed, when India liberated itself from the Britishers in 1947, the decision of the then Indian political leadership to retain association with the British Commonwealth, as it was known at that time, was hailed as an act of farsighted statesmanship. All through the independence struggle, Mahatma Gandhi had maintained that India's quarrel was with the British Government and not with the British people.

For the last 4 decades India-British relations have been marked by friendship and mutual understanding. Relations have expanded in every sphere, thanks to the common commitment of the two countries to democracy, parliamentary system, the rule of law, and fair play. Britain's contribution to India's economic development has been remarkable. Britain is among the big powers with whom India has had a flourishing 2-way trade and multi-sided economic and commercial cooperation. India-British relations have [words indistinct] the years by the fact that India is the world's largest democracy which Britain admires and respects. Thousands of Indians have made Britain their home. Interaction between India and Britain is constant and continuous. Every factor, therefore, points to the sustenance of close and smooth bilateral relations between the two countries. Admittedly, there are differences in approach and perceptions in respect of global, political and economic situations and developments. This is but natural considering that India is nonaligned and Britain is a partner of the Western alliance. Even so, efforts of the two countries in the last 4 decades have been directed to the development of friendly ties in areas of agreement. However, it is unfortunate and both the countries recognize it to be so that stresses and strains have developed in the last couple of years between them.

There had always been a measure of discontent in India that anti-Indian elements could operate freely in Britain, carry on propaganda against Indian policies and foment separatist feelings. This discontent intensified somewhat after the brutal murder of an Indian diplomat, Mr Mhatre, a few years ago. But in the last couple of years the number of anti-Indian elements have increased and the quality and level of their activities aimed at the destabilization of India has touched a higher degree.

This has been particularly noticed since antinational elements in India raised secessionist demands and their self-styled leaders were found to be operating with impunity on British soil. The activities of pro-Khalistani Sikh extremists, for instance, have received wide media attention both in Britain and India. We in India have found it inconceivable that a country professing friendship for us has not been able to curb such activities. We have also been dismayed that some of these elements received or had received in the past what can be almost regarded as patronage from the British Government. Whenever India has brought these matters to the notice of the British Government, the excuse offered is that British laws are so framed as to make it almost impossible to secure convictions in court even if the offender is arrested and prosecuted. Statements have continued to be made by the self-style Khalistani leaders preaching hatred and insurrection against India.

The activities of the Sikh extremists and of other organizations questioning the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India have contributed to the decline in India-British relations much to the chagrin of both the countries. The subject figured prominently in the discussions between Mr Rajiv Gandhi and Mrs Margaret Thatcher when the prime minister paid a 2-day official visit to Britain last October. Two specific proposals were discussed by the two leaders.

Britain offered to extend the provisions of the Antiterrorism Act to India. India suggested that the two countries should negotiate and finalize a treaty of extradition. The same subjects which stemmed from a deep concern in India over the activities of anti-Indian elements figured in New Delhi on Tuesday and Wednesday during the official visit of the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe. Between Mr Gandhi's visit to London and Sir Geoffrey's to New Delhi negotiations took place over the finalization of the extradition treaty. But they did not register any significant progress.

Let us examine the positions of the two governments in respect of the entire issue of Britain's approach to the problem of dealing with anti-Indian extremists. The British proposal, framed within the framework of existing laws, is to amend the existing treaty in such a way that it does not attract the provisions of political defense. Consequently, it would not be open to a British court to deny extradition because a wanted person enters the plea of political defense that he committed the offense for which a demand for his return is made on political not criminal grounds. India feels that this proposal does not go far enough since anyone sought to be extradited could still invoke the clause of humanitarian safeguards. In other words he can plea that he would not get a fair trial in the Indian court, or that he can be [words indistinct] punished.

The British retort to this argument is that the British courts are fully aware of the rule of law and justice which prevails in India and can be expected to take an objective view on such issues. Britain has offered to extend the Antiterrorism Act to India, pointing out at the same time that India will be the only country outside Europe to enjoy such extension.

India contends that this would not be a satisfactory solution and that it would prefer some kind of a bilateral arrangement. Britain would like the application of the Antiterrorism Act to be on a reciprocal basis. New Delhi is yet to define its position on this

request. The principal Indian contention is that British soil should not be allowed to be used as a springboard for campaigns of violence, disruption, and destabilization against India. Britain conceded the legitimacy of this concern and offered the assurance that it is willing to assist in the best manner possible. The hitch is partly procedural and partly legal that Britain was feeling that slight modfications to the existing laws could meet Indian demands.

During Sir Geoffrey's talks in New Delhi, the minister for external affairs, Mr Bali Ram Bhagat, pointed out that India wanted Britain to use its executive powers and political will to deal with the extremists there, just as it was acting against the Irish Republic Army terrorists. Britain should not only deny entry to the extremists but also deport such elements who are already acting against India. Sir Geoffrey was acquainted with the deep concern felt not only by the Parliament in India but by the general public in this regard. Britain had denied entry to Sri Lankan refugees seeking entry and in addition deported many of them. Why could not such treatment be meted out Sikh extremists also? What has upset India even more was that some of the anti-Indian elements had been given facilities like housing. At the same time Mr Bhagat also expressed India's appreciation for the British refusal to give political asylum to Mr Jaswant Singh Thekedar who is on the wanted list in India.

Sir Geoffrey readily conceded the legitimacy of the Indian concerns. He assured the external affairs minister that his government would do everything to prevent British soil for being used as the haven for terrorists. The foreign secretary addressed a press conference shortly after calling on the prime minister. He told newsmen that while he had no doctrinal or ideological antipathy to an extradition treaty, he did not see any need for a separate treaty. In Britain a statutory basis for extradition arrangements with Commonwealth countries was the Fugitive Offenders Act of 1967. So far problems have been sorted out on the basis of this act, and Britain is always ready to consider applications for extradition. So far no requests had come from India for extradition of any wanted offenders. Sir Geoffrey maintained that an extradition treaty will not have a speedy, practical, and psychological effect of the antiterrorism law. However, he was prepared to consider new legislation to strengthen the act replacing extraditable offenses with a more general list and making it impossible to invoke political motivation for conspiracy against India's integrity.

It is obvious that the position of the two governments vary in regard to the specifics of what needs to be done although both are agreeing that something needs to be done under the circumstances. Given good will, this is not an intractible issue.

Sir Geoffrey's visit must have provided him with a deeper insight into the Indian position. It may be reasonable, therefore, to expect that in the subsequent negotiations some areas of agreement can be evolved so that Britain can respond more positively to India's demands. These hopes are strengthened by the gesture of Sir Geoffrey in appointing a special representative on a personal basis to begin talks with the Indian side on the pending issues.

Protest Lodged With DRA Envoy Over Border Firing

BK080300 Karachi Domestic Service in Urdu 0200 GMT 8 Apr 86

[Text] On 4 April at about 1830, the Afghan armed forces fired several rounds from 12.7 mm machineguns from the Baqi post toward a post of the Pakistan militia on the outskirts of Chaman.

A soldier of the frontier corps received minor injuries in the firing. The Afghan charge d'affaires was summoned to the Foreign Office and a strong protest was lodged with him on this unprovoked attack.

Foreign Office Voices Satisfaction With SARC Meeting

BK070410 Karachi Domestic Service in Urdu 0200 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] The Government of Pakistan has expressed satisfaction over the outcome of the ministerial meeting of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation [SARC] on international economic problems.

A spokesman of the Foreign Office said in Islamabad that all the member countries agreed that this meeting will enable the South Asian countries to make known their viewpoints on international economic problems and thus will help in fulfilling the aspirations of the developing countries.

The spokesman said formal discussions among member countries in the headquarters of international organizations will prove very useful in realizing the common objectives approved by the declaration in Islamabad.

The spokesman expressed the hope that the summit meeting of the seven industrial nations in Tokyo next month will fully consider the proposals and stand of the SARC.

Reportage on Visit of Swiss Foreign Minister

Arrives 7 April

BK051052 Karachi Domestic Service in English 1005 GMT 5 Apr 86

[Text] The vice president and the foreign minister of Switzerland, Mr Pierre Aubert, is arriving in Islamabad on Monday [7 April] at the head of a 9-member delegation on a week-long visit to Pakistan. He is scheduled to hold talks with the foreign minister, Sahabzada Yaqub Khan. He is also expected to visit the Pak-Swiss agricultural and engineering project in Mardan and Afghan refugee tentage village near Peshawar, Tarbela dam, and the Taxila museum.

Meets With Yaqub Khan

BK071539 Karachi Domestic Service in Urdu 1500 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Excerpt] Swiss Vice President and Foreign Minister Pierre Aubert and Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yaqub Khan held talks on a number of issues in Islamabad today. They had a detailed exchange of views on regional matters and the international situation. The possibility of increasing cooperation between the two countries in trade and economic matters was also examined.

Pierre Aubert was apprised of the latest situation in Afghanistan. The two foreign ministers also exchanged views on a Swiss loan offer of 90 million francs.

NAWA-E WAQT Views Benazir Bhutto's Visit to U.S.

GF050902 Lahore NAWA-E WAQT in Urdu 28 Mar 86 p 3

[Editorial: "How Far is the United States Interfering in Our Politics?]

[Text] Those circles which are surprised at the visit to the United States of the acting chairman of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) Miss Benazir Bhutto prior to her return to Pakistan will be further surprised at what she said in an interview with VOA in Washington. In view of the residence in Kabul of the young Bhutto brothers, the general attitude of the PPP in the recent past has been that of opposition to the United States. We need not go into the "revolutionary" hopes and expectations which the circles and elements opposing the United States and favoring the Soviet Union had placed on the return to Pakistan of Miss Benazir Bhutto.

In her interview with the VOA not only did she openly thank the United States for its efforts to get her released from a 2-year-long house arrest for medical treatment abroad, but she minced no words in thanking the United States for the $4.2 billion aid, the agreement for which was recently concluded during the visit to Islamabad by Under Secretary of State William Schneider.

Although Miss Benazir Bhutto has referred to this aid as if it is being given for promoting democracy and for safeguarding human rights in Pakistan, she knows full well that the aid is being given for economic progress and for buying arms to strengthen Pakistan's defenses. Moreover, this aid is part of the aid program which the United States agreed to provide in 1981 in view of the situation created by the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. This aid program is to end in 1987.

At present there is no martial law in the country and democracy has been restored along with human rights. Miss Bhutto herself has accepted that the Junejo government is the first step toward democracy. Her remarks and admissions do not correspond with the position taken in Pakistan by most of the PPP's leaders, intellectuals, and zealots. It is only natural that one should think that whatever she has said in this interview is a part of her pilgrimage to Washington and a result of her talks and understandings with her "friendly circles" and political agreements reached with them.

These views of Miss Benazir Bhutto lead one to believe that the PPP has no fixed policy of its own. A few weeks ago she summoned some trustworthy stalwarts and leaders of her party to London for consultations and instructions. One of them, soon after his return to Pakistan, said that the PPP, after assuming power, would even change the name of Pakistan from the

"Islamic Republic of Pakistan" to the "Federal Socialist Republic of Pakistan."

Miss Benazir Bhutto while in Washington, however, not only thanked the United States for assisting in her release from house arrest but also openly welcomed in principle the aid which the United States has approved for Pakistan to face the danger looming from the Soviet Union (the claimant of global victory of socialism) after its military occupation of Afghanistan. The open contradiction which exists in the general policy of the PPP and this open statement of Miss Benazir Bhutto does not need any explanation. However, it will be interesting to watch how the party, which in its meetings chants slogans of "Asia is red," "Socialism is coming," "Death to American imperialism," "Long live the socialist revolution in Afghanistan," and other similar slogans displayed on huge banners will bring its ancient and traditional stand to coincide with the views expressed by Miss Benazir Bhutto in her interview with the VOA.

Her statements could be due to the expediency of the times as this has been the normal attitude of the PPP from the very beginning. In 1966, when the leader (later founder) of this party was removed from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he tried to give the impression that he was being removed under pressure from the United States. Soon after when he went on a 3-month rest and recreation trip to Britain and Europe, the fact could not remain hidden that the cost of this trip was borne by the "Stanley Foundation" of the United States. Later, in 1971 he came to power with American condescension. But in 1977, when due to his rigging of the elections and the resultant widespread protests, he had to surrender power, he attributed it to American interference. However, the thought-provoking result which has emerged from the Washington pilgrimage of Miss Benazir Bhutto is that the United States is so much involved in our affairs and is exercising so much influence that the question of one's coming to power and retaining power depends on American convenience and pleasure.

A few months ago when the leader of the Tehrik-e Istiqlal Party, Air Marshal (Retired) Asghar Khan, went to the United States on his "second private visit," at that time we heard of American blessings for the trip. The expulsion of the Tehrik Party's learned lawyer Chaudhury 'Itizaz Hussain from the party is said to have been due to his criticism of what Asghar Khan had said in the course of his visit to the United States.

Relations between Pakistan and the United States were strengthened in 1954 and 1955. However, the road was paved by our geography and history. Pakistan is situated on the border of a country which does not tolerate Pakistan's existence as a free and sovereign country, nor does it accept Pakistan's basic ideology. It is more or less the same with the United States, because this country likewise does not like our basic ideology. Moreover, the country which the United States prefers to have close relations with, due to its opportunist and disloyal policy, sometimes creates such difficulties for it that it is forced to give aid to Pakistan. However, the United States has not kept its preference a secret. The policies and paths of both countries for one reason or another are different, and for this reason there have always been ups and downs in relations between the two countries. Despite its economic and military aid to us, our relations are such that while we may not consider the United States an enemy, we have no trust in its friendship either.

Similarly, recent events have showed us that we cannot depend on the Soviet Union or have any faith in it. The reason is that it considers our relationship with the United States as a hindrance to having good relations with us. An opportunity for better relations and friendship with the Soviet Union arose when Pakistan withdrew a few years ago from U.S.-sponsored defense agreements and linked its fate with the Nonaligned Movement. But the Soviet Union, toward the end of 1979, created a situation by its military occupation of Afghanistan — an ancient, free, and traditionally nonaligned Muslim country — which was difficult and rather impossible for Pakistan to digest. It was under such a situation that Pakistan, in order to safeguard and strengthen its independence and territorial integrity, was forced to seek aid from the United States in order to purchase arms and improve its economic condition.

Miss Benazir Bhutto's visit to the United States requires special study and analysis to see how her party digests what she has said in addition to thanking the United States for its aid and prefering an end to the problem rather than the procedure of holding talks with Kabul -- the end being that Soviet forces are withdrawn from Afghanistan and the 3 million Afghan refugees return to their homes. It would be interesting to see how the PPP accepts these views as a part of its policy.

The PPP considers itself not only the most progressive, strongest, and most popular political party, but it also dreams of coming to power again. Miss Benazir Bhutto's Washington visit could be considered as part of this effort (a basic and important part) to fulfill the dream. In any case, it has become evident that the top leadership of the party not only expects a favorable change in the domestic affairs of the country but it also does nor hesitate to accept aid and blessings from abroad.

The United States has been involved from the very beginning in Pakistan's "power politics." Some examples of this were recently related in the Multan Press Club by His Excellency Qodruttullah Shahab, a former secretary of three successive presidents. It appears from Miss Bhutto's Washington statements that American intervention in our domestic affairs is not only limited to putting pressure on the rulers, but this game can be played behind the government's back also. This chain of events is continuing and it would not be out of place to say that the Washington visit of Miss Benazir Bhutto could be interpreted as the starting point of a new era.

Miss Benazir Bhutto's remarks in her interview -- vis-a-vis the elected government of Junejo as a first step toward democracy, not creating a law and order problem on her return to Pakistan, making contacts with the general public, and reorganizing the party -- can only be verified after her return to Pakistan and through her political activities. It would be a good thing if whatever she has said about not creating a problem of law and order and about avoiding a policy of agitation are respected.

One cannot help but look at news reports which indicate that some contact exists between the Junejo government and Miss Benazir Bhutto and that she is returning to Pakistan after

reaching some understanding with it. Her return is sure to have some effect on the country's politics and the echos of statements she aas made during her Washington visit are bound to be heard not only at present but for some time in future as well.

Commentary Cites IAEA Expert on Nuclear Program

BK060939 Karachi Domestic Service in English 1700 GMT 5 Apr 86

[M.I. Lashkar commentary]

[Text] Pakistan is a peace-loving country, and it cannot be anything contrary. So are peaceful purposes of its modest nuclear program. That is what is being emphasized by Pakistan, and that is what is being increasingly recognized by professional experts all over the world, in spite of the fact that certain quarters are questioning the peaceful nature of Pakistan's nuclear program for a political motive.

The latest such appreciation came from a person no less than the director general emeritus of International Atomic Energy Agency. Dr Sigvard Eklund, who headed the IAEA for 2 decades, categorically stated that Pakistan's nuclear system fulfilled the requirements of his agency for nonproliferation. Dr Eklund made the statement in Islamabad before leaving Pakistan last Monday [31 March] after a 5-day visit to the country during which he visited various nuclear installations and research centers in Pakistan.

Dr Eklund's professional view of Pakistan's nuclear objectives nullified the persistent misinterpretation about Pakistan's motive in acquiring nuclear know-how. Dr Eklund's remarks that additional safeguard conditions over and above those of his agency's which the Pakistani program fulfilled put by the supplier countries were being questioned in certain quarters also lends support to the view that the sustained propaganda campaign against Pakistan's nuclear program had been launched with ulterior motives. The propaganda and the suppliers' refusal on that account to supply spare parts for Pakistani installations have only impeded Pakistan's development in this particular area. But the motive is [words indistinct].

Dr Eklund, who lauded the achievements of Pakistan's Atomic Energy Commission in various fields, also recognized that the indigenous capacity and skill available in Pakistan acquire the nuclear option for application in the development process and said without cooperation from the developed countries Pakistan's nuclear achievements would merely be slowed down and would only take a longer period.

Indeed, Pakistan's energy gap is not the only reason for the country's nuclear program. The agricultural sectors which generate nearly one-third of our GNP have in some instances benefited immensely from the application of nuclear technology in the field. The extension of nuclear technology in the medical fields in the form of nuclear radiation and radioisotopes has proved its merits. And to any unbiased mind Pakistan's interest in the nuclear fuel cycle can only be based on technical and economic considerations.

It is Pakistan's consistent opposition to a vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons that gives credibility to Pakistan's legitimate demand for access to a technology which is considered essential for modern-day progress.

Mujahidin Operations in Paktia Province Detailed

BK070340 Karachi Domestic Service in Urdu 0200 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] According to a report, fierce fighting continued around mujahidin base at (Jawar) in Paktia Province for the second day yesterday and the mujahidin shot down the sixth military aircraft in this combat. According news agency reports, the mujahidin have besieged Karmal administration forces on various mountain peaks in the area and have asked them to lay down arms.

Khamene'i Voices Confidence in Victory

LD072101 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1630 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Excerpts] Special ceremonies on the Day of the Martyrs of the Armed Forces were held at the military academy, attended by the president, families of armed forces' martyrs and a number of civil and military officials.

At the ceremonies President Khamene'i said: Today, all superpowers and hegemonists are toying with the fate of nations. In the region, peoples who have culture, economy, and boundless resources must subordinate their policies to the wishes of the big powers, because the nations do not matter and only U.S. interests are important. Today, the interests of nations in South America, Africa, and Asia are sacrificed to the wishes of global politicians.

He added: With indescribable greatness the Iranian nation has stood up to these bullyings and has told other nations that they can stand up to powers and threaten U.S. interests.

In conclusion he said: A peace that would trample on the blood of our martyrs and not avenge them would be a disgraceful peace. It would be like applauding the aggressor. We say that peace can only be possible if the aggressor is punished. Our nation will continue this just war. We have no doubt that our nation and brave forces will defeat the audacious and aggressor regime.

Further Commentary on Bush Visit to Gulf States

U.S. Policy in Gulf War Criticized

GF071941 Tehran International Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Station commentary]

[Text] George Bush's visit to the Gulf region has left a wide echo in the circles interested in the affairs and concerns of the region. More than one world newspaper has commented on and analyzed the visit. Opinions conflict on the purpose of this visit and on the objectives expected from it. However, all agree that Bush's visit is aimed at studying the situation in the region following recent developments in the aggressive war launched by the Saddam regime.

If we reread what U.S. and European papers have written we will find there are two issues which attract the interest of the European and U.S. media. The first issue is the use of chemical weapons by the Saddam regime and the condemnation of the Security Council. The second issue is the failure of Saddam's regime to regain Al-Faw despite its media chaos in this regard.

The West European public opinion dealt with these two issues as issues which concern the Western world and deserve quick action, and as an urgent matter before their friends are in death throes. The conclusion which any Western analyst can draw from the use of chemical weapons by Saddam's regime and his insistence in using chemical weapons -- even after condemnation by the Security Council -- from the complete failure of the Iraqi regime to regain one inch of the land it lost during the "Val-Fajr-8" operations, and from the widespread demoralization that began to appear within the sectors of the Iraqi army and led to the fleeing of a large number of officers, NCO's, and soldiers to the Islamic Republic, is that Saddam's regime has reached the point beyond which it can only suffer more defeats on military and political levels. This presents Saddam's protectors and those who benefit from Iraq's wealth with one of two options: Either they can offer further aid to enable the regime to return to the point at which it can achieve a balance and continue its fierce aggression against the Muslim people in Iran, or they can change the Saddamist currency for another currency having the same value of oppression and adopting the same motives and interests which the United States is seeking.

There is no doubt that Bush's journey to the Gulf region, which began with Saudi Arabia, comes only as a response to the U.S. policy controlling events in the region. A close study of the war developments and the possibility of verifying the proposed options will reveal only the option of replacing the currency before it collapses and becomes valueless. On the basis of its policy of dealing with tense areas, the United States is doing its utmost to turn events into a card game and to deal these cards with the hope of beginning its political game in the region, relying on its allies and friends. In this way the United States dealt with the Palestinian issue and in this way it wanted to change the events inLebanon into card game in order to place its bets. But, as we have noticed, the plan was foiled by the Lebanese people.

It is obvious that the United States, relying on its friends this time, is trying to turn the issue of war — which is an issue of a just cause and a false one — into a card game for the U.S. political game, thus disavowing the rights of the two Muslim peoples in Iran and Iraq with the hope of eliminating these rights in preparation for the next round of betting. In all circumstances the United States will come up against the strong wall of reality that rejects any settlement other than eliminating the aggressors and enabling the people in Iraq to regain their usurped rights.

Tehran Arabic on Bush Tour

GF071854 Tehran International Service in Arabic 1810 GMT 7 Apr 86

[From the "Behind the News" program]

[Excerpts] U.S. Vice President George Bush arrived in Manama today on the second leg of a trip which began in Saudi Arabia. This tour will take him to Oman and the YAR. Considering the current situation in the region in light of the recent Islamic victories in the strategic battle of Al-Faw, it can be said that Bush's current tour is an extraordinary one because it represents the U.S. Administration's direct reaction to the successive and [word indistinct] events.

For the U.S. vice president to come to the region is an extraordinary reaction which definitely reflects continued U.S. concern over the strategic developments that have happened and will probably happen in the region. Nothing more than the Islamic-Ba'thist war has strategic importance to the region's current and future developments.

Besides Bush's current tour, what draws attention is the U.S. statements emphasizing possible hotbeds in the region regarding the expansion of the war and the closing of the Strait of Hormuz. Is there any U.S. intention to expand the war or is this a plot to blackmail others and instigate them to act in this direction? We do not rule out such U.S. thinking, especially when it concerns the rescue of the Baghdad regime. However, we discount any foolish moves on the part of Washington, at least at present, in this respect because the expansion of war in other areas will probably spread like wildfire through out the region. This is what Washington fears because this may cause the region to completely leave the scope of U.S. influence. Therefore, the U.S statements, whether they are made by Bush or Murphy, are only blackmail for the regimes to push them to be more tied to the train. At the same time, these statements are a kind of assurance to the regimes and governments in the region that the U.S. Administration will stand by their side and will never abandon them, particularly when there is an experience of abandonment, the last example of which was casting out Marcos alone without refuge [words indistinct].

Tour Linked to Oil Issues

GF081129 Tehran International Service in Arabic 0420 GMT 8 Apr 86

[From the "Pause With the Events" program]

[Excerpts] U.S. Vice President George Bush arrived in Saudi Arabia amid tight security to begin a tour during which he will visit Bahrain, Oman, and the YAR. During this tour, Bush is accompanied by Richard Murphy, U.S. assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, who earlier visited the UAE, Qatar, and Kuwait and conveyed messages from U.S. President Reagan to the leaders of these countries.

Some believe that the visits by Murphy and Bush to the Gulf region are to reassure these countries on recent developments in the region and to encourage the region's shaykhs to continue their policy tied to U.S. policy regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran.

It has been announced that during his visits to these countries, Bush will hold talks with officials on the developments of the imposed war and on oil prices. Concerning oil prices, it seems that the United States is becoming increasingly concerned with their precipitous drop and fluctuations. Despite the fact that this seems to be favorable to Reagan's administration, which used to welcome any drop in oil prices, this recent stand must be considered part of propaganda plots and plans by Washington and Arab reactionism to lower oil prices. The United States believes that the drop in oil prices to less than $10 per barrel, something not experienced over the past 13 years, would harm a considerable part of the workforce in the United States. The drop in oil prices puts pressures on U.S. oil companies and raises the specter of bankruptcy. If these oil companies stop operations, 10 percent of the U.S. workforce will become unemployed. Consequently, this will cause unexpected crises for the U.S. Government.

The Americans say that the drop in oil prices will control inflation in the United States, but that it should not be stabilized in a way that will lead to the bankruptcy of U.S. companies. In view of this, it has been announced that during his visit, Bush will try to convince Shaykh Zaki Yamani to make efforts to stabilize oil prices. Through this propaganda, efforts are being made to show that Saudi Arabia has independent views and is acting independently toward world oil prices. According to many experts, the purpose of this maneuver is to justify Saudi Arabia's stand and to show that OPEC is the reason for the current differences, when all can perceive the coordinated and active role by reactionism and arrogance in lowering oil prices and in plundering the interests and wealth of the Third World people for the sake of [words indistinct].

Lowering oil prices was achieved according to a certain policy to increase the growth in the Western economy and, more importantly, to put pressure on oil-producing countries, mainly Iran. Meanwhile, the West is worried about fluctuations in the oil market in the long run and seeks to stabilize oil prices at a certain level.

Kuwait Warned on Supplying War Information to Iraq

GF081419 Tehran International Service in Arabic 1330 GMT 8 Apr 86

[From the "Voice of Islamic Revolution in Iraq" program]

[Text] Confirmed reports indicate that a Kuwaiti naval base is collecting information on the war in the region. The base sends information to the Kuwaiti general command which in turn sends it to the Iraqi Army command. These reports add that the Kuwaiti authorities have agreed to place Kuwaiti airspace at the disposal of the Iraqi Air Force. The Iraqi military planes are now using Kuwaiti airspace. The Kuwaiti naval base provides these planes with geographical information when they cross Kuwaiti airspace, thus ensuring the security of these planes over Kuwaiti airspace.

Islamic Iran has warned Kuwait against placing its territory, waters, and airspace at the disposal of the terrorist regime ruling in Iraq.

Further Reportage on Visit of Zimbabwe's Mangwende

Joint Communique Signed

LD071758 Tehran IRNA in English 1657 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] Tehran, April 7, IRNA — The Islamic Republic of Iran and the Republic of Zimbabwe inked a joint communique here Monday at the conclusion of a three day official visit of the Zimbabwean Foreign Minister Dr. W.M. Mangwende and his entourage.

The communique issued simultaneously in Tehran and Harare covers a wide range of agreements and mutual policy positions on a host of international, economic regional issues including the Iraqi imposed war, the issue of the struggle against the apartheid regime in Pretoria and that of the Zionist occupiers in Palestine.

On the Iraqi imposed war, both sides denounced the flagrant violation of the 1925 Geneva Convention prohibiting chemical

and bacteriological warfare. They also called for a "vigorous" implementation of international laws and stressed the urgent need to contain the conflict from spreading to residential areas as well as endangering the peace and security in the region.

The two sides also assailed attacks on civilian and residential areas, merchant shipping, and threatening and attacks on civil aviation in the Iraq-Iran war. Air piracy as well as intercepting of (civil) airliners was also denounced in the communique.

On African and other major issues of the continent the two sides stressed the importance of strengthening the organization of African unity. They also backed the OAU's united stand to take the cause of continent's economic and other pertinent issues to the United Nations.

Both sides assailed South Africa's aggression against its neighbors and the frontline states. They also praised the resistance of these states against Pretoria's aggression and acts aimed at destabilizing them. Increased support for the "tyrannized people" of South Africa and all those engaged in the struggle in the continent against apartheid was also called for.

Ministers of Iran and Zimbabwe called on the international community to impose "comprehensive and mandatory" sanctions against Pretoria, while at the same time lashing out at those powers which assist the apartheid South African regime.

The decolonization of Namibia and the restoration of the Namibian people's right to sovereignty were also called for, while the U.S.-Pretoria alliance to undermine U.N. Resolution 435 articulating those rights were condemned.

Washington's policy of destabilizing progressive countries such as Angola, Nicaragua and Libya, particularly the U.S.'s recent maneuvers in waters close to the Libyan coast were also denounced.

Tehran-Harare extended mutual support for the deprived Palestinian people both inside and outside their occupied homeland. They also called for an intensification of the struggle, particularly inside occupied territories. They also came out in support of the principle of "armed struggle" to regain their "whole of the occupied territory."

The terrorism of the regimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria as well as the support rendered by their big power backers against the nations of these regions were also blasted by the two sides. Efforts of certain states, especially African to resume ties or establish ties with Zionist Israel and apartheid South Africa were also denounced.

Mutual Iran-Zimbabwe support was declared for the struggles of the Muslims and Lebanese against Israel and the multinational forces to liberate Zionist occupied Muslim land.

On Afghanistan, the military occupation of the country was condemned, and the withdrawal of the occupying forces was called for. Also support was declared for the right of the Afghan (Muslim) people to determined their destiny.

Also the two sides came out in support for the idea that the Indian Ocean should be kept free of nuke testing as well as superpower naval conflicts. They said such conflicts may destabilize or threaten the security of regional states.

The communique notes that both sides agreed to mutually cooperate in the international arena, while expressing opposition to the imperialist powers efforts to impose their viewpoints on oppressed countries.

NAM [Nonaligned Movement] member states were also called upon to strictly adhere to the principles of non-alignment, while Iran expressed its full readiness to assist Zimbabwe in its hosting of the 8th upcoming NAM summit meet in Harare. The Zimbabwean side also praised the construction role played by NAM as well as its efforts to adhere to its own policies.

Iran had earlier agreed to help Zimbabwe build an oil refinery and supply it with Iranian oil.

The Zimbabwean delegation during its three-day official visit to Iran also met and held useful exchange of views with President Khamene'i, Premier Musavi, Foreign Minister Velayati, Iranian commerce and industries ministers.

It was agreed that Tehran-Harare would enhance mutual cooperation in technical, economic, scientific and trade spheres, as a result of which similar agreements are expected to be signed. The Zimbabwean delegation left Tehran Monday.

Commentary Attacks Trial of Muslims in Egypt

GF071817 Tehran International Service in Turkish 1830 GMT 6 Apr 86

[Unattributed commentary: "The Trial of Egyptian Muslims"]

[Text] Dear listeners, the attorney general of Egypt has asked for the death penalty for 1,202 policemen who rebelled on 25 and 26 February. Long prison terms with hard labor were asked for another 31 civilians placed under arrest at the time.

Although the Egyptian regime has not yet disclosed how many of those discharging their national service as policemen were martyred or killed during the rebellion, the press statement made by the attorney general of Egypt makes it easier to understand that the number of those who participated in the rebellion is well over the estimated amount. This is also confirmed by the death penalty asked for the first time for a group of more than 1,200 people.

By arguing in his press statement that the rebellion started by the policemen discharging their national service stemmed from an internal agitation, the attorney general wished to create the impression that the uprising was not related to the conditions faced by Egypt's Muslim community. Contrary to the disclosures made earlier by a number of Egyptian officials, he claimed that the February rebellion was not connected with any religious or political group. The claim put forward by the attorney general conflicted with the disclosures made by the Egyptian authorities.

By arguing that the Egyptian police have no ties with the Egyptian Muslims, he revealed his actual incoherence.

If the rebellion of the Egyptian police is not related to the Muslim Egyptian people and is a simple incident stemming from an internal agitation, then why has the attorney general of Egypt kept the civilians arrested at the time of the rebellion in prison until now and why has he asked for heavy prison terms for 31 civilians?

Undoubtedly, the rebellion of the Egyptians discharging their national service as policemen is a continuation of the moves made by the Egyptian Muslims aimed at ridding Egypt from the bondage of Camp David and converting it into an independent and free country. These moves are a continuation of a struggle spearheaded by Khalid al-Islambulis and Sulayman Khatirs. Naturally, they will continue until the Egyptian Muslims free their country from the United States and the regime occupying Palestine.

The struggle waged by the Egyptian Muslims against imperialism and the Zionists for converting Egypt into a free and independent Islamic country will be regarded as a front among those in the Islamic world. The Egyptian Muslims will not allow the revolutionary Muslims to be illegally prosecuted by a mercenary servant like the attorney general of Egypt. Nor will they allow any move made by the Egyptian authorities against the people to remain unanswered.

Forces From Qom, Tabriz Leave for Battlefronts

LD071318 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1030 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] The Central News Unit reports from Qom that more than 1,000 volunteer mobilization forces together with a large party of clergy from Qom seminary set off this morning in a special convoy for the battlefronts from the site of the Qom Islamic Revolution Guards Corps mobilization unit. They were given a warm sendoff by the alert people of Qom, who chanted slogans of "War, war until victory!"

The Central News Unit reports from Tabriz that one company consisting of the mobilization unit of the meek of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps of the Haris District left this morning for the battlefronts. They were seen off by the alert inhabitants of this district, who chanted slogans of "War, war until victory!"

Reportage on Combat Operations in War With Iraq

Iraqi Offensive 'Crushed'

LD071657 Tehran IRNA in English 1615 GMT 7 Apr 86

[Text] Tehran, April 7, IRNA — An enemy offensive launched in Sharhani operation region and Majnun Islands at 04:00 a.m. (0030 GMT) Monday was crushed by Islamic combatants infantry and armored forces and thanks to their effective defence strategy. During the futile enemy attempt heavy blows were inflicted on the aggressor forces.

According to a military communique published by the Joint Staff Command of the Armed Forces Monday, oil and economic installations in the Iraqi townships of Ban-Mil and Naft Khaneh were also shelled by Iran's Islamic combatants stationed in the western fronts. In these artillery attacks too considerable losses were inflicted on the enemy.

Elsewhere in the war fronts, the communique said heavy exchange of fire raged between the two sides in the southern fronts being more intense in Sharhani and Majnun Island regions. Movements of enemy tanks and logistic vehicles were also halted in Faqqeh and Nahr-Anbar regions, it said.

In the western fronts, according to the communique, the movement and activity of an enemy patrol unit was suppressed in the area opposite Kani-Sheykh. In the northwestern fronts, it added, Iranian patrol groups were active and in Piranshahr and Haj 'Umran regions, limited logistic movements of the enemy troops were under the control of the Islamic combatants.

It concluded that Abadan in Khuzestan Province sustained some damage as a result of long range enemy shelling of the city Sunday.

Opposition Paper Warns GCC Countries

GF071235 London KEYHAN in Persian 27 Mar 86 p 6

[Editorial: "Toward Correcting the Course in the Persian Gulf"]

[Text] Since the start of the Iran-Iraq war, the conservative countries of the Persian Gulf have realized that a laissez-faire, wait-and-see policy would in the long run draw the fire of the war to their homes as well. The latest declaration of the foreign ministers of the GCC countries indicates that it was more than correcting the course discussed in their meeting.

At the start of the war, the GCC member countries — Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, UAE, and Oman — each, for one reason or another, had their concern tinted with a hue of joy. Kuwait, which was afraid of Iraqi aggression toward its territory, was not unhappy over the Ba'thist regime of Baghdad being involved in a war. The fall of the shah removed the strongest barrier in the way of any possible aggression from Iraq against Kuwaiti territory, but Saddam Husayn, who has never kept his appetite within limits, was thinking of conquering Khuzestan and, during those wonderful days, had no eye on Kuwait.

Saudi Arabia was not unhappy over the start of a war between Iraq and Iran. The war would cause the two major countries of the Persian Gulf to be practically omitted from the range of local or regional cooperation. If the war had not taken place, it would have been almost impossible for this cooperation council to come into existence without the participation of Iran and Iraq, or to have had any stability and durability. Saudi Arabia -- who, due to the isolation of Egypt after the "Camp David" peace, had strengthened its position in the Arab world -- had only two other rivals for leadership in the Arab world. The first, Syria, in view of its crooked and distorted policy, could not expect to lead the Arabs. Moreover, it was always in need of financial assistance from Saudi Arabia. The other potential rival to Saudi Arabia for

the leadership of the Arab world was Iraq. Its involvement in war with Iran was the best possible excuse to keep it away from the center of politics in the Arab world. At the same time Iran's involvement in the war gave an opportunity to Saudi Arabia to appear the superior power in the entire Persian Gulf region and the Gulf of Oman.

Smaller countries in the region thought that the involvement in war of the two major countries in the Persian Gulf — Iran and Iraq — was in their best interests. They had no interest in bringing peace to their two belligerent neighbors. This analysis indicates that GCC members, each for its own reason, helped to continue the war. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have met a major part of Iraq's war expenditure. The UAE, meanwhile, has in practice -- especially in supplying arms and food and in offering port facilities -- been on the side of the Islamic Republic.

Can we now say that GCC members have taken a new stance toward the calamitous Persian Gulf war? Their opportunist policy has only been a wasted opportunity. They have always avoided looking at the dreadful reality which stares them in the face today. The Islamic Republic will never give up its expansionist aspirations. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, UAE, and Oman are all on the ayatollah's blacklist. The ayatollah intends to establish his own individual rule in all Islamic countries. Those who deceive themselves, like an ostrich burying its head in the sand, will come around when shook by an explosion. The ayatollah does not consider any present government in Islamic countries as lawful except that in his own country. Even Syria is not beyond this concept, and Hafiz al-Asad has never been accepted as the leader of an lawful Islamic government.

GCC members at first glance have no more than two paths to traverse: first, to abstain from supporting Saddam, accept the fall of the Saddam Husayn regime, and establish of the ayatollah regime in Baghdad. In this case we must wait for the time when the ayatollah makes the second weak link in the chain — Kuwait — a target of his ambition and begin knocking over "dominoes".

Second, to join the war. Of course, the countries in question are even now involved in the war, but we can say that at present only a small part of their resources is being put to use in this field. This second path is also full of dangers. Even a large military coalition with the participation of all Arab countries of the region would not be able to guarantee victory over Iran. Iran's military manpower capabilities are such that it can put the entire region into blood and dust, without the Arabs having any hope of a victory.

Let us now see whether there is any other way to deal with this problem? We may say "yes", under certain conditions. The countries of the region, more than anyone else, should know that they cannot try to be clever and play the game from both sides. Their wavering policy is why they are trusted by neither Tehran nor Baghdad. People should give up their opportunistic policies and sincerely try to end the war and restore peace in the region. In that case, they should accept the reality of the existence of Iran as an important power in the region while they try to see that the resources of Iran are directed toward peace and internal construction, instead of being used toward the war and expansionist schemes. In other words, they should give up their chauvinistic prejudices and know that their deliverance lies within the framework of a nationalistic and progressive Iran. Toppling the Khomeyni regime and replacing it with a competent national regime is the only way to establish peace in the region. However, toppling Khomeyni cannot be linked with the defeat of Iran and abstaining from accepting Iran's position as the dominant power in the region.

Surely, the countries of the region have not forgotten the sweet memories of cooperation with Iran in the past. The people of Iran then considered the people of this region their sincere brothers and they consider them so even now. They have always expressed their sympathy and unanimity with the people of the region. Our compatriots in the Persian Gulf littoral countries and the people of those countries considered themselves to be living in their own country, among their own brethren. The governments of these countries considered cooperation and collaboration with Iran the basis for a pleasant and hopeful future for their nations.

The Persian Gulf war, which began with Iraqi aggression against Iran, has mobilized the nationalistic Iranian forces along the path of the defense of their homeland. The ayatollah has taken undue advantage of this coincidence; he derives power from a source which does not belong to him. As long as the Arabs consider the war as between "the Arabs and non-Arabs" or between "Sunnis and Shi'ites" it will only result in strengthening the ayatollah. The only way to deliver the region and return Iran to the path it followed prior to the Islamic revolution is to follow the path of peace, constructiveness, and progress.

During the course of its constructiveness Iran was the only country in the region which did not go to war or involve itself in any expansionist schemes. The conclusion of the 1975 agreement in Algeria identified the Iran and Arab border and a new era in the history of the Persian Gulf was opened. Khomeyni and Saddam together brought this era to an end and opened a chapter of their destruction and bloodshed. It is obvious that neither of them will have any place in the future of the region.

The latest communique of the foreign ministers of the GCC countries has revealed another important point. The moderate Arabs have now realized that the ayatollah makes the best of every weakness yet respects the language of force. Iranians also have come to know this point after many years; in other words, it has become too late for some of them. If he could, the ayatollah would bully everyone, but if he found strong opposition, he would crawl into his shell.

The people of Iran consider the countries and the nations of the Persian Gulf region to be their brothers and co-religionists and respect their rights. The sound of hostility and enmity heard from Tehran is from the throat of a regime which has no bond with its nation. Therefore, the worst strategy for opponents of the ayatollah is to talk high but act low. This fact has resulted in the bitterest experiences for Iran. In foreign countries as well, the experience of Jimmy Carter, who seemed as if he was firing guns, but in his heart was wagging his tail, has not yet been forgotten.

Will the GCC ministers repeat the same experience or will they learn from the experience of others? The future will tell!